arXiv:1401.5352v1 [math-ph] 21 Jan 2014

Effective Casimir Conditions and Group Coherent States

Martin Bojowald[1*] and Artur Tsobanjan[1,2†]

[1] Institute for Gravitation and the Cosmos, The Pennsylvania State University, 104 Davey Lab, University Park, PA 16802, USA

[2] American University, 4400 Massachusetts Ave NW, Washington, DC 20016, USA

Abstract

Properties of group coherent states can be derived "effectively" without knowing full wave functions. The procedure is detailed in this article as an example of general methods for effective constraints. The role of constraints in the present context is played by a Casimir condition that puts states within an irreducible representation of a Lie group (or, equivalently, on a quantization of a co-adjoint orbit of the dual Lie algebra). Simplifications implied by a Casimir condition, compared with general first-class constraints, allows one to show that the correct number of degrees of freedom is obtained after imposing the condition. When combined with conditions to saturate uncertainty relations, moments of group coherent states can be derived. A detailed example in quantum cosmology (cosmic forgetfulness) illustrates the usefulness of the methods.

1 Introduction

There are several different definitions of coherent states based on group-theoretical properties, which all play important roles in diverse areas of theoretical physics. Explicit examples of wave functions of coherent states can show aspects of quantum evolution and semiclassical phenomena in a clean way, but it is not always possible to find such explicit realizations in general-enough terms. However, physical properties can still be extracted if one works with moments of a state instead of wave functions, a description which is the basis also of canonical effective theory [1, 2]. Dynamical equations for the moments follow from generalizations of Ehrenfest's equations, while coherence is implemented by the condition that moments saturate uncertainty relations. The main link to group coherent states, studied in this article, is the imposition of an additional Casimir condition that restricts moments to states that belong to an irreducible representation of a Lie group describing the quantum system (or the quantization of a co-adjoint orbit in the dual Lie algebra of the group).

Imposing the Casimir to be constant can be interpreted as a constraint on the original (non-symplectic) phase space with a Poisson structure given by the dual Lie algebra,

*e-mail address: bojowald@gravity.psu.edu

†e-mail address: artur.tsobanjan@gmail.com

suggesting that methods for effective constraints [3, 4] can be used. Because a Casimir operator $\hat{C}$ commutes with all other operators, additional simplifications compared with general first-class constraints arise: (i) expectation values $\langle\hat{O}\hat{C}\rangle$, which feature prominently in effective constraints, equal the symmetric version $\frac{1}{2}\langle\hat{O}\hat{C}+\hat{C}\hat{O}\rangle$ and are guaranteed to be real for self-adjoint $\hat{O}$ and $\hat{C}$, and (ii) no gauge flow $\delta\langle\hat{O}\rangle/\delta\epsilon = \langle[\hat{O},\hat{C}]\rangle/i\hbar$ generated by a Casimir constraint need be considered. (On a non-symplectic phase space, first-class constraints do not necessarily generate gauge flows.) These simplifications allow us to confirm, to all orders in a semiclassical or moment expansion, that the correct number of quantum degrees of freedom is left after imposing the Casimir condition.

In a second step, we then combine the Casimir condition with the requirement that uncertainty relations be saturated, restricting moments to those of a group coherent state. Higher orders of moments are more difficult to manage at this level, but we will be able to demonstrate several interesting relationships between the different conditions imposed.

Quantum cosmology presents an example in which standard group coherent states are not always available in general terms, that is with full squeezing, while the effective methods elaborated here do apply. We end our article with a detailed discussion, clarifying the contentious issue of cosmic forgetfulness [5] which posits that certain pre-big bang models in loop quantum cosmology [6] suffer from a severe lack of control on the pre-big bang state. This issue has lost its urgency with the recent discovery that the same models, when embedded consistently in a setting with perturbative inhomogeneity, lead to signature change at high density [7, 8], so that no state can be evolved deterministically through the big bang. Nevertheless, the issue of cosmic forgetfulness may still be of interest from a mathematical perpective.

2 Effective Casimir constraints

For simplicity, we consider the case of a single Casimir condition C, imposed on a non-symplectic phase space so that the submanifold $C = \text{const}$ is symplectic. The phase-space function C can be seen as one coordinate of a Poisson manifold, such that C itself is a Casimir function in the Poisson sense, and submanifolds $C = \text{const}$ are the symplectic leaves. Since C, by definition, has a vanishing Poisson bracket with any other function on the Poisson manifold, it does not generate a Hamiltonian gauge flow when viewed as a constraint. Nevertheless, it can be identified as a first-class constraint owing to the non-symplectic nature of the phase space. (Notions equivalent for symplectic geometry and usually associated with first-class constraints, such as the properties of non-trivial gauge flows and symplectic properties of constraint sets, may no longer be equivalent for Poisson manifolds. The generalization of standard definitions therefore requires some care [9].)

As an example, we may look at a 3-dimensional manifold equipped with coordinates (or basic functions) V, J_+, J_- and Poisson brackets $\{V, J_+\} = J_-$, $\{V, J_-\} = -J_+$ and $\{J_+, J_-\} = -V$, for instance interpreted as the (dual) Lie algebra of $\mathrm{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$. The Casimir function reads $C = J_+^2 + J_-^2 - V^2$. Another way to interpret the same system is to use partially complex variables V with $J = J_+ + iJ_-$ and $J^* = J_+ - iJ_-$. One can then realize

the Poisson brackets

$$\{V, J\} = -iJ \quad , \quad \{V, J^*\} = iJ^* \quad , \quad \{J, J^*\} = 2iV \tag{1}$$

by functions V and $J := V\exp(-iP)$ of canonical variables V and P with $\{V, P\} = 1$. Setting the Casimir function to zero, $C = JJ^* - V^2 = 0$, then amounts to a reality condition for P. In this form, the Casimir condition plays a role in some cosmological models [10, 11].

Upon passing on to the quantum treatment of the system, the role of C as a first-class constraint (though one on a non-symplectic phase space) allows us to employ the effective-constraint methods developed in [3, 4, 12]. To this end, we view the corresponding quantum system algebraically, based on the commutators of basic operators quantizing (1). The state space of the algebra can be formulated geometrically by making use of the expectation-value functional $\langle\cdot\rangle$, applied to all polynomials in basic operators. Expectation values of products of operators are identified as moments

$$\Delta(V^a J_+^b J_-^c) := \langle(\hat{V} - \langle\hat{V}\rangle)^a(\hat{J}_+ - \langle\hat{J}_+\rangle)^b(\hat{J}_- - \langle\hat{J}_-\rangle)^c\rangle_{\mathrm{Weyl-ordered}} \tag{2}$$

of the basic operators in a state considered. Any product that is not Weyl-ordered can be rearranged as a sum of Weyl-ordered terms, some of which with explicit $\hbar$-factors. The set (2) therefore prescribes the expectation values for all polynomials in the basic variables. A Poisson geometry of the quantum phase space, given by expectation values and moments of basic operators, is provided by the commutator, defining a Poisson bracket on expectation-value functionals by

$$\{\langle\hat{A}\rangle, \langle\hat{B}\rangle\} = \frac{\langle[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]\rangle}{i\hbar}\,, \tag{3}$$

extended to all functions by the Leibniz rule.

One element of this algebra is the Casimir or constraint operator $\hat{C}$ to be imposed as a constraint, $\hat{C}|\psi\rangle = 0$. (For a non-zero Casimir, we can simply redefine the constraint operator as $\hat{C} - \mathrm{const}\hat{\mathbf{1}}$ without changing commutators.) Evaluated in any state annihilated by $\hat{C}$, the expectation values $\langle\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}\hat{C}\rangle$ must all vanish for arbitrary polynomials $\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}$ in the basic operators. For one quantum constraint operator we obtain an infinite number of constraint functions on the quantum phase space. For multiple ones, if the quantum constraints are first class, the system of effective constraints is first-class in the phase-space sense [3]. In the special case of a Casimir constraint, all effective constraints are Casimir functions on the Poisson manifold defined by (3): it is straightforward to see that a constraint of the form $\langle\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}\hat{C}\rangle = 0$ weakly Poisson commutes with all quantum phase-space functions if $\hat{C}$ commutes with all operators.

For first-class constraints on symplectic phase spaces, the viability of these methods has already been demonstrated, addressing also the problem of time [13, 14, 15]. In general, the ordering of effective constraints in the specific form

$$C_{\mathrm{pol}} := \langle\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}\hat{C}\rangle \tag{4}$$

is important for the system of constraints in order to remain first class and to vanish in physical states. We may assume symmetric polynomials without loss of generality, because re-ordering terms would just contribute quantities proportional to lower-order constraints. However, even if the basic operators and $\hat{C}$ are assumed to be self-adjoint with respect to some $*$-relation on the basic algebra, which we will do in what follows, the ordering in (4) is in general not symmetric, leading to the possibility of complex-valued effective constraints. For Casimir conditions, on the other hand, we have $[\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}, \hat{C}] = 0$ by definition, so that we can substitute the symmetric ordering $\frac{1}{2}\langle\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}\hat{C} + \hat{C}\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}\rangle$ without changing the expectation value. We are therefore dealing with real-valued effective constraints for all polynomial or moment orders. Moreover, Casimir conditions are easier to implement because no gauge flows need be considered: we have a vanishing

$$\{\langle\hat{O}\rangle, \langle\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}\hat{C}\rangle\} = \frac{\langle[\hat{O}, \widehat{\mathrm{pol}}]\hat{C}\rangle}{i\hbar} \approx 0$$

on the solution space of the effective constraints, again using the commutation property of a Casimir. This simplification is the main reason that allows us to directly test effective methods at higher orders in moments.

2.1 Removing degrees of freedom

In classical systems, Casimir constraints remove phase-space degrees of freedom so that, in the absence of a gauge flow, the constraint surface is symplectic. The dimension of a symplectic manifold is restricted to be even, and its quantization corresponds to a fixed pattern of expectation values and moments: for every canonical pair (q, p) there are two independent expectation values and, starting with $n = 2$ reaching ad infinitum, a tower of $n + 1$ moments for every integer n, defined as in (2) for a single canonical pair of basic operators:

$$\Delta(q^a p^b) := \langle(\hat{q} - \langle\hat{q}\rangle)^a(\hat{p} - \langle\hat{p}\rangle)^b\rangle_{\mathrm{Weyl-ordered}} \,. \tag{5}$$

Semiclassically, a moment of order n behaves like $O(\hbar^{n/2})$, giving rise to a general semiclassical expansion with a finite number of degrees of freedom per canonical pair at any fixed order n. If this pattern is violated, one cannot interpret the degrees of freedom in the usual way of quantum mechanics, indicating either extra constraints if there are not enough free moments or spurious degrees of freedom if too many variables remain unrestricted. In particular, for a single Casimir constraint we must, by imposing $C_{\mathrm{pol}} = 0$, eliminate sufficiently many variables to leave a certain number of canonical pairs with their characteristic moments.

For the example of one quadratic Casimir constraint on a 3-dimensional Poisson manifold such as the one of (V, J_+, J_-), one can heuristically see that the reduction is correct, working locally and assuming that all effective constraints are independent. Taking an expectation value $\langle\hat{C}\rangle = 0$ restricts the basic expectation values to two independent ones (for fixed second-order moments). The next order of constraints is obtained for $\langle\hat{A}\hat{C}\rangle = 0$

with $\hat{A}$ one of the three basic operators (or a linear combination of them). Fixing third-order moments, we obtain three constraints for the six second-order moments of three independent basic operators, just enough to restrict the second-order moments to three independent ones: two fluctuations and one correlation. To see the correct reduction in numbers for all orders, we note that one can, at least locally, view the Casimir function as a coordinate on the Poisson manifold transversal to symplectic leaves. Instead of using basic phase-space functions such as V, J_+ and J_-, we can locally transform to Casimir–Darboux coordinates of a canonical pair (q,p) on the symplectic leaf and C transversally. This decomposition is relevant also for the counting of degrees of freedom of the corresponding quantum system. As for constraints, in addition to the expectation value of $\hat{C}$, we must remove all moments of $\hat{C}$ with itself (such as the fluctuation ΔC) as well as all cross moments with $\hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$. These cross moments are nothing but the effective constraints $\langle\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}\hat{C}\rangle = 0$, with $\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}$ a polynomial of degree n to restrict C-moments of order $n+1$. Since there are as many cross-moments as constraints of this form, we obtain the correct number of degrees of freedom provided the constraints are all independent (and the local argument remains valid in quantum theory).

In most cases, and always if the coordinate change to Casimir–Darboux coordinates is not global, the transformation from (V,J_+,J_-) to (q,p,C) is non-linear and relationships between (V,J_+,J_-)-moments and (q,p,C) are non-trivial. For instance, a moment of low order in one system may involve moments of all orders in the other. For a global statement about parameter counting, more-detailed considerations must be performed.

2.2 Counting truncated constraint conditions

For more generality, we work with a general finite-dimensional algebra of generators $\hat{x}_i$, $i = 1,2,\ldots M$, denoting their expectation values (or, occasionally, the corresponding classical values) by x_i, $i = 1,2,\ldots M$. To define the moments, we introduce

$$\widehat{\Delta x}_i := \hat{x}_i - x_i\hat{\mathbf{1}}$$

and their Weyl-ordered products

$$\hat{e}_{\vec{i}} = \hat{e}_{(i_1,i_2,\ldots i_M)} := \left(\widehat{\Delta x}_1^{\,i_1}\widehat{\Delta x}_2^{\,i_2}\ldots\widehat{\Delta x}_M^{\,i_M}\right)_{\mathrm{Weyl-ordered}},$$

which form a linear basis for the (extended) algebra. We use a compact notation in which $\vec{i}$ is an M-tuple of non-negative integers. Expectation values

$$\Delta(\vec{x^i}) := \Delta(x_1^{i_1}\cdots x_M^{i_M}) = \langle\hat{e}_{\vec{i}}\rangle\,. \tag{6}$$

of the basis elements are the moments. For later use we define the degree $|\vec{i}| := \sum_{n=1}^M i_n$ and a partial ordering $\vec{i} \geq \vec{j}$ if $i_n \geq j_n$ for all n, so that $\vec{i} > \vec{j}$ if $\vec{i} \geq \vec{j}$ and $\vec{i} \neq \vec{j}$. We will use $\vec{i}!$ to denote $(i_1!i_2!\ldots i_M!)$ and, as already defined in (6), $\vec{x^i} = x_1^{i_1}\cdots x_M^{i_M}$. By construction, $\Delta(\vec{x^i}) = 0$ for all $\vec{i}$ with $|\vec{i}| = 1$.

Interpreting the $\hat{x}_i$ as basic operators of a quantum system, we assume that their commutator algebra is linear (and follows from a direct quantization of Poisson brackets of the corresponding classical functions):

$$[\hat{x}_i, \hat{x}_j] = i\hbar \epsilon_{ij}{}^k \hat{x}_k \tag{7}$$

where $\epsilon_{ij}{}^k$ are structure constants, identical to the structure constants of the classical Poisson algebra. For a semisimple Lie algebra, which we will assume in an example later in this article, ϵ_{ijk} with the third index pulled down by contraction with the Killing metric, are totally antisymmetric. The case of the Weyl algebra $[\hat{q}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar\hat{\mathbf{1}}$ for a single canonical pair, as another important example, does not seem to fall within the current setting. However, we could treat $\hat{q}$, $\hat{p}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{1}}$ as three 'generators' or, alternatively, start from the Heisenberg algebra $[\hat{q}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar\hat{z}$ and enforce a constraint $\hat{C} = \hat{z} - \hat{\mathbf{1}}$ in the way described below.

It follows that

$$\left[\widehat{\Delta x_i}, \widehat{\Delta x_j}\right] = i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ij}{}^k \hat{x}_k = i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ij}{}^k \left(\widehat{\Delta x_k} + x_k \hat{\mathbf{1}}\right) \tag{8}$$

with the two right-hand-side terms respectively of polynomial degree 1 and 0 in the operators $\widehat{\Delta x_i}$. (This relation is not formulated for linear operators, owing to the presence of expectation values that depend on a state. Nevertheless, the usual rules can be applied if one treats x_k, during a calculation, as some real number and identifies it with the expectation value of $\hat{x}_k$ only in the final results.) In this form, the relation plays an important role in considerations of orderings: it allows one to apply commutators to symmetrically order any product of $\widehat{\Delta x_i}$-s by adding terms of lower polynomial degree and proportional to powers of $\hbar$,

$$\hat{e}_{\vec{i}}\hat{e}_{\vec{j}} = \hat{e}_{(\vec{i}+\vec{j})} + \hbar \sum_{\substack{\vec{k} < \vec{i}+\vec{j} \\ |\vec{k}| \leq |\vec{i}+\vec{j}|-1}} {}^{(1)}\beta_{\vec{i},\vec{j}}{}^{\vec{k}}\, \hat{e}_{\vec{k}} + \hbar^2 \sum_{\substack{\vec{k} < \vec{i}+\vec{j} \\ |\vec{k}| \leq |\vec{i}+\vec{j}|-2}} {}^{(2)}\beta_{\vec{i},\vec{j}}{}^{\vec{k}}\, \hat{e}_{\vec{k}} + \cdots$$

where ${}^{(n)}\beta_{\vec{i},\vec{j}}{}^{\vec{k}}$ are polynomials in the expectation values x_i.

2.2.1 Constraints and truncation

Following the general procedure of effective constraints, the Casimir condition of an operator $\hat{C}$ is imposed by demanding $\langle f(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_M)\hat{C}\rangle = 0$ for all polynomial functions f. These are infinitely many conditions for infinitely many moments, but working order by order in the moments (or in a semiclassical expansion) one can truncate these conditions systematically using the basis $\{\hat{e}_{\vec{i}}\}$. We introduce

$$C_{\vec{i}} := \langle \hat{e}_{\vec{i}}\, \hat{C}\rangle = 0, \quad \forall\, \vec{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^M$$

with the convention $\hat{e}_0 = \hat{\mathbf{1}}$, so that $C_0 := \langle \hat{C}\rangle$. In order for the truncation to be consistent, we must suitably combine the truncation of constraint functions according to the degree $|\vec{i}|$ with a truncation of variables that feature in the system.

Assume that we truncate at some order $N \geq 2$ of the semiclassical expansion: we drop moments of degree greater than N, that is all $\Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}})$ with $|\vec{i}| > N$. The truncation of the system of constraints is more subtle. All $C_{\vec{i}}$ are linear functions of the moments $\Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{j}})$, but they contain terms of three different types. It is useful to assign orders to these terms according to their type, as follows:

- A term of the form $f(x_1, x_2 \ldots x_M)\Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}})$, where f is a polynomial in the expectation values not proportional to the classical constraint, is assigned semiclassical order equal to $|\vec{i}|$.

- A term of the form $C(x_1, x_2 \ldots x_M)\Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}})$, where C is the classical polynomial expression for the constraint, requires a special treatment. As an exception to the previous point, it is assigned semiclassical order $|\vec{i}| + 2$. This exception can be understood from the fact that $C(x_1, x_2 \ldots x_M)$, although it may not vanish exactly when quantum corrections are included in $C_0 = C + O(\hbar)$, is of the order $\hbar$ when the quantum constraint $C_0 = 0$ is imposed. See also [3].

- Terms such as $\hbar^n f(x_1, x_2 \ldots x_M)\Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}})$, which may arise upon reordering algebra elements, are assigned semiclassical order equal to $|\vec{i}| + 2n$.

All these orders are consistent with the correspondence of order n to terms $O(\hbar^{n/2})$ as it applies to the moments. To truncate, terms in any expression for a constraint function are dropped when they are of semiclassical order higher than N.

2.2.2 Counting degrees of freedom

We begin by counting the degrees of freedom of an unconstrained system generated by polynomials in M basic variables (for a phase space of dimension M). We have M expectation values and, at each semiclassical order $N \geq 2$, the degrees of freedom are represented by the independent functions $\Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}})$ with $|\vec{i}| = N$.

The task of counting degrees of freedom is simplified by rephrasing the problem: The number of such variables is given by the number of M-tuples of non-negative integers with $|\vec{i}| = N$, a quantity that we will call $\mathcal{N}_M(N)$. Each such M-tuple is produced by considering a row of $N + M - 1$ identical objects, marking $M - 1$ of them to serve as partitions. The value of i_n is then the number of unmarked objects between partition $(n-1)$ and partition n. (Partitions 0 and M are assumed to be at the ends.) With this rephrasing we directly obtain

$$\mathcal{N}_M(N) = \binom{N + M - 1}{M - 1}.$$

Each constraint, in the absence of gauge flows, removes a single classical degree of freedom, and we expect the tower of effective constraint conditions to remove the corresponding moments. After the constraints are imposed, there should be as many degrees of freedom as for a system with $M - 1$ generators, with $\mathcal{N}_{M-1}(N) = \binom{N+M-2}{M-2}$ free variables

at each semiclassical order. Using the identity $\binom{a}{b} - \binom{a-1}{b} = \binom{a-1}{b-1}$, we conclude that the required number of independent conditions at each order should be $\binom{N+M-2}{M-1}$.

In order to show consistency of the effective procedure, we now proceed to counting the number of conditions independently. This question is more difficult to answer because constraint conditions $C_{\vec{i}}$ generally mix terms of different orders. As a first step, we show that, truncated at a given order, the system of constraints is finite. The number of constraints at each order is then the number of additional non-trivial constraint conditions that arise when we raise the truncation order by one.

A general constraint function has the form

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\vec{i}} &= \sum_{\vec{j}\geq\vec{i}} \frac{1}{(\vec{j}-\vec{i})!} \frac{\partial^{|\vec{j}-\vec{i}|} C}{\partial x_1^{j_1-i_1} \ldots \partial x_M^{j_M-i_M}} \Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{j}}) + \hbar \sum_{|\vec{j}|\geq|\vec{i}|-1} {}^{(1)}\alpha_{C_{\vec{i}}}{}^{\vec{j}}\, \Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{j}}) \\ &\quad + \hbar^2 \sum_{|\vec{j}|\geq|\vec{i}|-2} {}^{(2)}\alpha_{C_{\vec{i}}}{}^{\vec{j}}\, \Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{j}}) + \ldots + \hbar^{|\vec{i}|} \sum_{\vec{j}} {}^{(|\vec{i}|)}\alpha_{C_{\vec{i}}}{}^{\vec{j}}\, \Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{j}}) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Here ${}^{(n)}\alpha_{C_{\vec{i}}}{}^{\vec{j}}$ are coefficients of semiclassical order zero, polynomial in the expectation values x_i. The first sum comes from the Weyl-symmetric part of the element $\hat{e}_{\vec{i}}\,\hat{C}$. Subsequent sums arise from its components that are antisymmetric in one, two and more adjacent pairs of moment-generating elements $\widehat{\Delta x}_i$. Each antisymmetric pair can be reduced by using the commutation relations, producing the powers of $\hbar$. For a Casimir constraint, $\hat{C}_{\vec{i}}$ is guaranteed to be real; therefore, there must be an even number of commutators applied in each re-ordering step and we have only even powers of $\hbar$, or ${}^{(n)}\alpha_{C_{\vec{i}}}{}^{\vec{j}} = 0$ for odd n.

The important feature of the above expansion is that the lowest semiclassical order terms are $C\Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}})$ and

$$\bar{C}_{\vec{i}} := \sum_k \frac{\partial C}{\partial x_k} \Delta(\vec{x}^{(i_1,\ldots,i_{k-1},i_k+1,i_{k+1},\ldots,i_M)})\,. \tag{10}$$

The latter term has the lowest order, $|\vec{i}|+1$, keeping in mind that for the purposes of truncating the constraints, C is of order 2. After truncation at order N, constraints $C_{\vec{i}} = 0$ are satisfied identically for all $|\vec{i}| > N-1$. This observation allows us again to rephrase the counting problem: The number of non-trivial conditions up to order N is the same as the number of non-negative integer M-tuples of degree $N-1$ and less. As we go from truncation at order $N-1$ to truncation at order N, this number changes by the number of M-tuples of degree $N-1$, which is exactly the quantity $\mathcal{N}_M(N-1) = \binom{N+M-2}{M-1}$ required to be eliminated by the counting of degrees of freedom.

Thus, provided the non-trivial constraint conditions remaining after truncation are functionally independent, they remove precisely one combinatorial degree of freedom in the quantum mechanical sense. In order to show independence, which is done in detail in [16], one considers the gradients $\{\mathrm{d}_\Delta \bar{C}_{\vec{i}}\}_{1\leq|\vec{i}|\leq N-1}$ on the space of expectation values and moments. While the operator d_Δ takes the gradient with respect to the quantum moments only, the functional independence conditions derived depend predominantly on the classical

form of the constraint function. For a semiclassical state, applying careful truncations as before, one can conclude: (i) The truncated constraints are independent as long as dC (the gradient taken with respect to the expectation values only) is not comparable to $\hbar$ or the moments in at least one coordinate direction, assuming that expectation values satisfy the classical constraint. This condition can be interpreted as the semiclassical analog of regularity of the constraints. (ii) For expectation values off the classical constraint surface, the constraint functions are functionally independent as long as, for some k, neither $\partial C/\partial x_k$ nor $\partial^{N-2}(C^{-1})/\partial x_k^{N-2}$ are comparable to $\hbar$ or the moments.

The conditions may clearly be violated somewhere on the quantum phase space, but near the classical constraint surface terms such as $1/C$ and its derivatives diverge and appear in the gradients. The gradients, unlike the constraints, can thus be considered "large." These conditions are sufficient, but not necessary, so that in some cases the constraints may be independent even if the conditions do not hold. To summarize, so long as the classical constraint is sufficiently regular, the truncated set of gradients $\{\mathrm{d}_\Delta \bar{C}_{\vec{i}}\}_{1\leq|\vec{i}|\leq N-1}$ is linearly independent for expectation values x_i lying in some neighborhood of the classical constraint surface $C=0$, leading to functional independence of the truncated set of constraint functions in that region.

3 Uncertainty relations

For moments of a group coherent state, in a quantization of a co-adjoint orbit on the dual of the Lie algebra corresponding to (7), we require that uncertainty relations be saturated. Together with the Casimir condition, several equations are then to be solved.

We first derive uncertainty relations, beginning the usual procedure familiar from textbooks on quantum mechanics. We pick a pair $(\hat{x}_i, \hat{x}_j)$ of basic operators, assumed self-adjoint as noted before. Starting with a generic state ψ in a Hilbert-space representation of the basic algebra, we introduce three new states $v_{x_i} := \widehat{\Delta x_i}\psi$, $w_{x_j} := \widehat{\Delta x_j}\psi$ and $u_{x_i,x_j} := w_{x_j} - (v_{x_i}\cdot w_{x_j}/||v_{x_i}||^2)v_{x_i}$. The uncertainty relation for our pair of operators then follows from

$$0 \leq ||u_{x_i,x_j}||^2 = ||w_{x_j}||^2 - \frac{|v_{x_i}\cdot w_{x_j}|^2}{||v_{x_i}||^2}\,, \tag{11}$$

with saturation if and only if $u_{x_i,x_j}=0$.

Inserting our specific expressions for u_{x_i} and w_{x_j} in terms of ψ, we can express each term in the Schwarz inequality $||v_{x_i}||^2||w_{x_j}||^2 \geq |v_{x_i}\cdot w_{x_j}|^2$ in terms of moments. We easily obtain $||v_{x_i}||^2 = \Delta(x_i^2)$ and $||w_{x_j}||^2 = \Delta(x_j^2)$ and, with a little more re-ordering work,

$$|v_{x_i}\cdot w_{x_j}|^2 = |\langle(\hat{x}_i - x_i)(\hat{x}_j - x_j)\rangle|^2 = |\Delta(x_ix_j) + \tfrac{1}{2}i\hbar\epsilon_{ij}{}^k x_k|^2 = \Delta(x_ix_j)^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{4}(\epsilon_{ij}{}^k x_k)^2\,.$$

Uncertainty relations

$$\Delta(x_i^2)\Delta(x_j^2) - \Delta(x_ix_j)^2 \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4}(\epsilon_{ij}{}^k x_k)^2 \tag{12}$$

in standard form then follow.

3.1 Higher orders

Higher-order moments are restricted by higher-order uncertainty relations. We can derive them by using non-linear polynomials in the $\widehat{\Delta x_i}$ to define states $v_{\mathrm{pol}_1} := \widehat{\mathrm{pol}_1}\psi$ and $w_{\mathrm{pol}_2} := \widehat{\mathrm{pol}_2}\psi$ and proceeding as before. Without loss of generality, we require $\widehat{\mathrm{pol}_{1/2}}$ to be Weyl-ordered. Unlike (12), these higher-order relations mix moments of different orders. (For recent work on higher-order uncertainty relations with canonical basic operators, see [17].)

The first ones beyond (12), for instance, involve moments of second, third and fourth order, obtained when pol_1 is linear and pol_2 quadratic (or vice versa). Using the relations in the appendix, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} ||w_{x_jx_k}||^2 &= \Delta(x_j^2x_k^2) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2\left(\epsilon_{jk}{}^l\epsilon_{jl}{}^m\Delta(x_kx_m) - \epsilon_{jk}{}^l\epsilon_{kl}{}^m\Delta(x_jx_m)\right) - \frac{3}{4}\hbar^2\epsilon_{jk}{}^l\epsilon_{jk}{}^m\Delta(x_lx_m) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

(no sum over repeated lower indices) and

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle v_{x_i}, w_{x_jx_k}\rangle|^2 &= \left(\Delta(x_ix_jx_k) - \frac{1}{12}\hbar^2\left(\epsilon_{ik}{}^l\epsilon_{lj}{}^m + \epsilon_{ij}{}^l\epsilon_{lk}{}^m\right)x_m\right)^2 \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{4}\hbar^2\left(\epsilon_{ij}{}^l\Delta(x_kx_l) + \epsilon_{ik}{}^l\Delta(x_jx_l)\right)^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

If we only consider terms of lowest order (six), this third-order uncertainty relation becomes

$$\Delta(x_j^2x_k^2)\Delta(x_i^2) - \Delta(x_ix_jx_k)^2 \geq 0. \tag{15}$$

Unless there are third-order correlations between the basic variables, the only implication is that fourth-order moments of the form $\Delta(x_j^2x_k^2)$ must be positive, which already follows from their definition.

The next order of uncertainty relations is more interesting and bounds fourth-order moments by a positive number. Defining $\vec{\hat{x}}^{\vec{i}} = \left(\hat{x}_1^{i_1}\hat{x}_2^{i_2}\ldots\hat{x}_M^{i_M}\right)_{\mathrm{Weyl-ordered}}$, in general, the leading-order contribution to the uncertainty relation implied by $\widehat{\mathrm{pol}_1} = \vec{\hat{x}}^{\vec{i}}$ and $\widehat{\mathrm{pol}_2} = \vec{\hat{x}}^{\vec{j}}$ is of the form

$$\Delta(\vec{x}^{2\vec{i}})\Delta(\vec{x}^{2\vec{j}}) - \Delta(\vec{x}^{2\vec{i}+2\vec{j}}) \geq U \tag{16}$$

where U follows from the squared imaginary part of $\langle\vec{\hat{x}}^{\vec{i}}\vec{\hat{x}}^{\vec{j}}\rangle - \Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}+\vec{j}})$. The leading order is obtained if exactly one commutator is applied in the re-ordering required to bring $\langle\vec{\hat{x}}^{\vec{i}}\vec{\hat{x}}^{\vec{j}}\rangle$ into $\Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}+\vec{j}})$. It has two contributions, one of degree $2(|\vec{i}|+|\vec{j}|+1)$ (after taking the square) from the $\widehat{\Delta x_k}$-term in (8), and one of order $2(|\vec{i}|+|\vec{j}|)$ from the x_k-term. The latter is always of the same order as the leading contribution on the left-hand side of (16), except when it happens to vanish. It always vanishes for third-order uncertainty relations (15) because it contains only the vanishing $\Delta(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}})$ with $|\vec{i}| = 1$. For higher orders, however, U in (16) is non-zero to leading order, so that the familiar form of uncertainty relations is obtained, with the right-hand side non-zero and proportional to $\hbar^2$.

3.2 Relations for group coherent states

Group coherent states obey Casimir conditions and saturate uncertainty relations. We will now explore the interplay of these different conditions, focusing on the case of a 3-dimensional semisimple Lie group of rank one. In particular, the counting problem, treated in the previous section for a Casimir condition irrespective of uncertainty relation, is again of relevance. On the unrestriced state space, ignoring the Casimir condition, we obtain an independent uncertainty relation (12) for every pair of generators $\hat{x}_i$. When the Casimir condition is imposed, some degrees of freedom are removed, and we should expect a smaller number of independent uncertainty relations. For instance, for a 3-dimensional Lie group of rank one, we start with three second-order uncertainty relations, one for every pair among three basic operators, but should have only one independent one for the 2-dimensional phase space left after the Casimir condition is imposed. This counting problem is difficult to analyze at arbitrary orders, but it is instructive to have a look at the leading orders of second-order moments that feature in (12).

Under the present assumptions, we have a quadratic Casimir $C = k^{ij}x_ix_j - c = 0$ with a constant c, using the Killing metric k^{ij}. To lowest order, such a condition implies that

$$\bar{C}_{\vec{i}} = 2x_ik^{ij}\Delta(\vec{x^i}x_j) = 0\,, \tag{17}$$

using (10). For higher-order contributions, we must perform more-explicit calculations keeping track of all necessary re-orderings. It is then useful to write the corresponding Casimir operator in terms of $\widehat{\Delta x_i}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C} &= k^{ij}\hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j - c\hat{\mathbf{1}} = k^{ij}(\widehat{\Delta x_i} + x_i)(\widehat{\Delta x_j} + x_j) - c\hat{\mathbf{1}}\\ &= k^{ij}\widehat{\Delta x_i}\widehat{\Delta x_j} + 2k^{ij}x_i\widehat{\Delta x_j} + k^{ij}x_ix_j - c\hat{\mathbf{1}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

The effective Casimir condition then reads

$$\langle\hat{C}\rangle = k^{ij}\Delta(x_ix_j) + k^{ij}x_ix_j - c = 0\,, \tag{18}$$

and can be used to simplify $\hat{C}$ "on-shell," that is when the basic Casimir condition holds:

$$\hat{C} \approx k^{ij}(\widehat{\Delta x_i}\widehat{\Delta x_j} - \Delta(x_ix_j)) + 2k^{ij}x_i\widehat{\Delta x_j}\,. \tag{19}$$

In this form, the condition is useful for higher-order effective constraints because the lower-order ones will already be taken care of. Moreover, (18) does not explicitly depend on c, so that representation-independent relations between expectation values and moments of different orders will be obtained. (The actual values of moments depend on c and the representation once specific solutions to (18) are used.)

The next-order conditions are obtained from $\frac{1}{2}\langle\widehat{\Delta x_k}\hat{C} + \hat{C}\widehat{\Delta x_k}\rangle$, in which we directly write the symmetric ordering (and use $\widehat{\Delta x_k}$ because the x_k-terms subtracted from $\hat{x}_k$ would just multiply lower-order constraints). However, not all terms in $k^{ij}(\hat{x}_k\hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j + \hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j\hat{x}_k)$ are

ordered totally symmetric and give rise to moments as defined in (6). To change the ordering in this cubic case, we make use of the identity

$$\frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{D}+\hat{B}\hat{D}\hat{A}) = (\hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{D})_{\rm Weyl-ordered} + \frac{1}{12}([[\hat{A},\hat{B}],\hat{D}]+[[\hat{A},\hat{D}],\hat{B}]) + \frac{1}{4}\{\hat{A},[\hat{B},\hat{D}]\} \quad (20)$$

and write

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\left(\widehat{\Delta x_k}\hat{C}+\hat{C}\widehat{\Delta x_k}\right) &= k^{ij}(\widehat{\Delta x_i}\widehat{\Delta x_j}\widehat{\Delta x_k})_{\rm Weyl-ordered} \\ &\quad +k^{ij}\left(\frac{1}{6}[[\widehat{\Delta x_k},\widehat{\Delta x_i}],\widehat{\Delta x_j}]-\Delta(x_ix_j)\widehat{\Delta x_k}\right)+2k^{ij}x_i(\widehat{\Delta x_j}\widehat{\Delta x_k})_{\rm Weyl-ordered}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Its expectation value gives the third-order Casimir condition

$$\frac{1}{2}\langle\widehat{\Delta x_k}\hat{C}+\hat{C}\widehat{\Delta x_k}\rangle = k^{ij}\Delta(x_ix_jx_k)-\frac{\hbar^2}{6}k^{ij}\epsilon_{ki}{}^l\epsilon_{lj}{}^m x_m+2k^{ij}x_i\Delta(x_jx_k)\approx 0\,. \quad (21)$$

Even though the condition is derived from third-order operators, its leading term (the last one in the equation) is of second order because the Casimir operator does not depend just on $\widehat{\Delta x_i}$. If moments (and explicit factors of $\hbar$) of higher than second order are ignored, the third-order Casimir condition restricts second-order moments by

$$x^j\Delta(x_jx_k)\approx 0\,, \quad (22)$$

where we raise the index using the Killing metric. This result is clearly a special case of (17).

To the next order, we obtain from $\langle(\widehat{\Delta x_k}\widehat{\Delta x_l})_{\rm Weyl-ordered}\hat{C}\rangle = 0$ the relation

$$\begin{aligned}&2x^i\Delta(x_ix_kx_l)+k^{ij}\left(\Delta(x_ix_jx_kx_l)-\Delta(x_ix_x)\Delta(x_kx_l)\right) \quad (23)\\ &+\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2k^{ij}\left(3\epsilon_{i(k}{}^m\epsilon_{l)j}{}^n\Delta(x_mx_n)+2\epsilon_{i(k}{}^m\epsilon_{l)m}{}^n\Delta(x_jx_n)+2\epsilon_{mj}{}^n\epsilon_{i(k}{}^m\Delta(x_{l)}x_n)\right)\\ &-\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2k^{ij}\epsilon_{ki}{}^m\epsilon_{lj}{}^n x_mx_n\approx 0\,.\end{aligned}$$

For totally antisymmetric ϵ_{ijk}, the second line simplifies to $-\frac{5}{6}\hbar^2\Delta(x_lx_k)-\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2\delta_{lk}\Delta(x^ix_i)$, and the last line to $-\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2(\delta_{lk}x^ix_i-x_lx_k)$.

3.3 Interplay of Casimir conditions and uncertainty relations

With the more-explicit form of effective Casimir conditions found in the preceding subsection, we can see how the number of uncertainty relations is reduced. As before, we assume a 3-dimensional Lie algebra with three uncertainty relations (12). We start with the relation obtained for the pair $(\hat{x}_1,\hat{x}_2)$ and use (22) to bring it to the form of one of the others. To this end, we multiply the left-hand side of (12) with $(x^1)^2$ and rewrite using

$$\begin{aligned}x^1\Delta(x_1^2) &= -x^2\Delta(x_2x_1)-x^3\Delta(x_3x_1)\\ x^1\Delta(x_1x_2) &= -x^2\Delta(x_2^2)-x^3\Delta(x_3x_2)\\ x^1\Delta(x_1x_3) &= -x^2\Delta(x_2x_3)-x^3\Delta(x_3^2)\end{aligned}$$

several times. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(x^1)^2(\Delta(x_1^2)\Delta(x_2^2)-\Delta(x_1x_2)^2) &= ((x^2)^2\Delta(x_2^2)+2x^2x^3\Delta(x_2x_3)+(x^3)^2\Delta(x_3^2))\Delta(x_2^2)\\ &\quad -(x^2\Delta(x_2^2)+x^3\Delta(x_2x_3))^2\\ &= (x^3)^2(\Delta(x_2^2)\Delta(x_3^2)-\Delta(x_2x_3)^2)\,,\end{aligned}$$

just as needed for the left-hand side of the uncertainty relation belonging to the pair $(\hat{x}_2,\hat{x}_3)$.

On the right-hand side, we have $x^1\epsilon_{12}{}^k x_k = x^1\epsilon_{123}x^3 = -x^3\epsilon_{32k}x^k$, using the behavior of structure constants for rank-1 semisimple Lie algebras. Also the right-hand sides will then match, showing that the uncertainty relations for $(\hat{x}_1,\hat{x}_2)$ and $(\hat{x}_2,\hat{x}_3)$ are not independent. Similarly, one can show that the one for $(\hat{x}_1,\hat{x}_3)$ is not independent either, demonstrating that only one independent uncertainty relation is left after the Casimir condition is imposed.

Including higher orders in the Casimir constraints, we have

$$\begin{aligned}x^1\Delta(x_1^2) &= -x^2\Delta(x_2x_1)-x^3\Delta(x_3x_1)-\frac{1}{2}\Delta(x^ix_ix_1)+\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2x_1\\ x^1\Delta(x_1x_2) &= -x^2\Delta(x_2^2)-x^3\Delta(x_3x_2)-\frac{1}{2}\Delta(x^ix_ix_2)+\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2x_2\\ x^1\Delta(x_1x_3) &= -x^2\Delta(x_2x_3)-x^3\Delta(x_3^2)-\frac{1}{2}\Delta(x^ix_ix_3)+\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2x_3\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(x^1)^2(\Delta(x_1^2)\Delta(x_2^2)-\Delta(x_1x_2)^2) &= (x^3)^2(\Delta(x_2^2)\Delta(x_3^2)-\Delta(x_2x_3)^2)\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2}x^j\Delta(x^ix_ix_j)\Delta(x_2^2)\\ &\quad +x^3\left(\Delta(x^ix_ix_3)\Delta(x_2^2)-\Delta(x^ix_ix_2)\Delta(x_2x_3)\right)\\ &\quad +\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2\left((x^1x_1+x^2x_2-x^3x_3)\Delta(x_2^2)+2x^3x_2\Delta(x_2x_3)\right)\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{4}\Delta(x^ix_ix_2)^2+\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2x_2\Delta(x^ix_ix_2)-\frac{1}{36}\hbar^4x_2^2\,.\end{aligned}$$

In the second line one can use (23), which brings in fourth-order moments. This shows that the interplay of different uncertainty relations subject to Casimir conditions is more complicated and mixes the orders. A more systematic description of higher-order uncertainty relations would be useful.

4 Example: Reality conditions of harmonic loop quantum cosmology

As a detailed application, we consider, as introduced in Sec. 2, basic operators satisfying the $\mathrm{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ algebra

$$[\hat{V},\hat{J}]=\hbar\hat{J}\quad,\quad [\hat{V},\hat{J}^\dagger]=-\hbar\hat{J}^\dagger\quad,\quad [\hat{J},\hat{J}^\dagger]=-2\hbar(\hat{V}+\hbar/2) \tag{24}$$

subject to the condition $\hat{J}\hat{J}^\dagger = \hat{V}^2$. (This example is not exactly of the form discussed previously, owing to the central extension by $\hbar/2$. However, as this central extension is trivial, the same results hold true. One may absorb $\hbar/2$ in the definition of $\hat{V}$, but we will keep this term explicitly since it contributes to some quantum corrections.) For expectation values, the operator identity $\hat{C} = \hat{J}\hat{J}^\dagger - \hat{V}^2$ implies the equation

$$|J|^2 - (V + \hbar/2)^2 = (\Delta V)^2 - \Delta(JJ^*) + \frac{1}{4}\hbar^2 \tag{25}$$

relating expectation values to fluctuations of $\hat{V}$, $\hat{J}$ and $\hat{J}^\dagger$. Alternatively, we may write the condition as

$$J_+^2 + J_-^2 - V^2 = (\Delta V)^2 - (\Delta J_+)^2 - (\Delta J_-)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\hbar(2V + \hbar) \tag{26}$$

for moments of self-adjoint operators $\hat{V}$, $\hat{J}_+ = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{J} + \hat{J}^\dagger)$ and $\hat{J}_- = -\frac{1}{2}i(\hat{J} - \hat{J}^\dagger)$.

Equation (25) reduces the number of degrees of freedom contained in the expectation values back to the usual canonical value of two. In this counting, the fluctuations on the right of (25) are considered fixed. Independent conditions for fluctuations and higher moments arise at higher order by considering operators

$$\left((\Delta\hat{V})^i(\Delta\hat{J}_+)^j(\Delta\hat{J}_-)^k\right)_{\rm Weyl}(\hat{J}_+^2 + \hat{J}_-^2 - \hat{V}^2) \quad \text{with} \quad i + j + k > 0\,, \tag{27}$$

whose expectation values vanish. In terms of Δ-operators, the reality condition reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{C} &= \widehat{\Delta J_+}^2 + \widehat{\Delta J_-}^2 - \widehat{\Delta V}^2 + 2J_+\widehat{\Delta J_+} + 2J_-\widehat{\Delta J_-} - (2V + \hbar)\widehat{\Delta V} \\
&\quad + J_+^2 + J_-^2 - (V + \hbar/2)^2 - \hbar^2/4 \\
&\approx \widehat{\Delta J_+}^2 - \Delta(J_+^2) + \widehat{\Delta J_-}^2 - \Delta(J_-^2) - \widehat{\Delta V}^2 + \Delta(V^2) \\
&\quad + 2J_+\widehat{\Delta J_+} + 2J_-\widehat{\Delta J_-} - (2V + \hbar)\widehat{\Delta V}
\end{aligned}$$

analogous to (19). For symmetric reorderings of Δ-operators, we then use the relations

$$[\widehat{\Delta V}, \widehat{\Delta J_+}] = i\hbar(\widehat{\Delta J_-} + J_-) \tag{28}$$

$$[\widehat{\Delta V}, \widehat{\Delta J_-}] = -i\hbar(\widehat{\Delta J_+} + J_+) \tag{29}$$

$$[\widehat{\Delta J_+}, \widehat{\Delta J_-}] = -i\hbar(\widehat{\Delta V} + V + \hbar/2)\,. \tag{30}$$

For instance, the third-order moments

$$\Delta(VJ_\pm^2) \equiv \left\langle(\hat{V} - V)(\hat{J}_\pm - J_\pm)^2\right\rangle_{\rm Weyl-ordered} \tag{31}$$

$$\Delta(V^3) \equiv \left\langle(\hat{V} - V)^3\right\rangle \tag{32}$$

appear in the reality condition

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Delta(VJ_+^2)+\Delta(VJ_-^2)-\Delta(V^3) \\ &\quad +2J_+\Delta(VJ_+)+2J_-\Delta(VJ_-)-(2V+\hbar)\Delta(V^2) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{6}\hbar^2(2V+\hbar) \end{aligned}$$

following from the vanishing expectation value of $\Delta\hat{V}(\hat{J}_+^2+\hat{J}_-^2-\hat{V}^2)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Delta(J_+^3)+\Delta(J_+J_-^2)-\Delta(J_+V^2) \\ &\quad +2J_+\Delta(J_+^2)+2J_-\Delta(J_+J_-)-2V\Delta(VJ_+)-\hbar\Delta(VJ_+)-\frac{\hbar^2}{6}J_+\,, \\ 0 &= \Delta(J_-^3)+\Delta(J_+^2J_-)-\Delta(J_-V^2) \\ &\quad +2J_-\Delta(J_-^2)+2J_+\Delta(J_+J_-)-2V\Delta(VJ_-)-\hbar\Delta(VJ_-)-\frac{\hbar^2}{6}J_-\,. \end{aligned}$$

Third-order reality conditions restrict semiclassical second-order moments. To leading order in $\hbar$ (keeping only the "central charge" $\hbar/2$ as a higher-order contribution to V),

$$(V+\hbar/2)\Delta(V^2) = J_+\Delta(VJ_+)+J_-\Delta(VJ_-) \tag{33}$$

$$(V+\hbar/2)\Delta(VJ_+) = J_+\Delta(J_+^2)+J_-\Delta(J_+J_-) \tag{34}$$

$$(V+\hbar/2)\Delta(VJ_-) = J_-\Delta(J_-^2)+J_+\Delta(J_+J_-)\,. \tag{35}$$

In terms of moments of complex variables, as derived in [18] and used crucially to restrict initial values of moments for numerical solutions of equations of motion, this reads

$$(V+\hbar/2)(\Delta V)^2 = \mathrm{Re}(J^*\Delta(VJ)) = \mathrm{Re}J\mathrm{Re}\Delta(VJ)+\mathrm{Im}J\mathrm{Im}\Delta(VJ)\,. \tag{36}$$

The remaining third-order relations imply

$$\begin{aligned} (V+\hbar/2)\mathrm{Re}\Delta(VJ) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{Re}J\mathrm{Re}(\Delta J)^2+\mathrm{Im}J\mathrm{Im}(\Delta J)^2+\mathrm{Re}J\Delta(JJ^*)\right)\,, \\ (V+\hbar/2)\mathrm{Im}\Delta(VJ) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{Re}J\mathrm{Im}(\Delta J)^2-\mathrm{Im}J\mathrm{Re}(\Delta J)^2+\mathrm{Im}J\Delta(JJ^*)\right)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

By our general considerations, none of the higher-order conditions restrict second-order moments further. (The lowest-order term given by (17) is of order three or higher for Casimir conditions of order four or higher.) Initially, we have six second-order moments. By higher-order reality conditions, they are subject to three further conditions, leaving three degrees of freedom as expected for two fluctuations and one correlation.

4.1 Uncertainty relations and existence of coherent states

For the pairs $(\hat{V},\hat{J}_+)$, $(\hat{V},\hat{J}_-)$ and $(\hat{J}_+,\hat{J}_-)$ of self-adjoint operators, we obtain from (12):

$$(\Delta V)^2(\Delta J_+)^2-\Delta(VJ_+)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}\hbar^2J_-^2 \tag{38}$$

$$(\Delta V)^2(\Delta J_-)^2 - \Delta(VJ_-)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}\hbar^2 J_+^2 \tag{39}$$

$$(\Delta J_+)^2(\Delta J_-)^2 - \Delta(J_+J_-)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}\hbar^2(V+\hbar/2)^2\,. \tag{40}$$

Our previous counting argument has shown that one canonical pair and its moments are left after the Casimir condition is imposed. As in the general case of Casimir conditions, the reality conditions ensure that two of the uncertainty relations are indeed equivalent to the third one.

A state saturating the uncertainty relation and obeying the Casimir condition is a coherent state for the group that provides the phase space. If we solve the saturated uncertainty relation (or its higher-order analogs) that remains after the Casimir condition has been used, we obtain moments that could belong to a coherent state, but it is not obvious that there is an actual (normalizable) wave function for them. In fact, constructing explicit wave functions for coherent states can be a complicated procedure. Fortunately, in a concrete example, one can show, without constructing the actual wave function, that there is always a wave function that produces "coherent" moments obtained by solving saturated uncertainty relations.

To show this, we begin in the standard way used in quantum mechanics, where a Gaussian is obtained as the unique wave function saturating the canonical uncertainty relation. For our two basic operators $\hat{V}$ and $\hat{J}_+$ and some state ψ we introduce, as before, two states $v := (\hat{V}-V)\psi$ and $w := (\hat{J}_+ - J_+)\psi$, with expectation values taken in the same state ψ. From standard arguments it then follows that the (V, J_+)-uncertainty relation is saturated if and only if $u := w - (v\cdot w/||v||^2)v$ vanishes. In our example, this equation reads

$$\hat{J}_+\psi - \frac{\Delta(VJ_+) + \frac{1}{2}\langle[\hat{V},\hat{J}_+]\rangle}{(\Delta V)^2}\hat{V}\psi + \left(\frac{\Delta(VJ_+) + \frac{1}{2}\langle[\hat{V},\hat{J}_+]\rangle}{(\Delta V)^2}V - J_+\right)\psi = 0\,. \tag{41}$$

We may represent states as wave functions $\psi = \sum_n \psi_n|n\rangle$ in terms of $\hat{V}$-eigenstates $|n\rangle$ with $\hat{V}|n\rangle = n|n\rangle$ (assuming the discrete series of representations, which is relevant for the quantum-cosmological application). On these eigenstates, using the realization $\hat{J} = \exp(-i\hat{P})$ in terms of canonical operators $(\hat{V},\hat{P})$, $\hat{J}|n\rangle = (n+1)|n+1\rangle$ acts like the product of $\hat{V}$ with a raising operator, and the Hermitian combination as

$$\hat{J}_+|n\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\left((n+1)|n+1\rangle + n|n-1\rangle\right)\,.$$

The saturation equation (41) for a wave function ψ is therefore equivalent to a difference equation

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(n\psi_{n-1} + (n+1)\psi_{n+1}\right) - \alpha n\psi_n + \beta\psi_n = 0 \tag{42}$$

where we denoted the coefficients in (41) as

$$\alpha = \frac{\Delta(VJ_+) + \frac{1}{2}\langle[\hat{V},\hat{J}_+]\rangle}{(\Delta V)^2} = \frac{\Delta(VJ_+) + \frac{1}{2}i\hbar J_-}{(\Delta V)^2} \tag{43}$$

and

$$\beta = \alpha V - J_+ \,.$$

Since expectation values and moments in α and β themselves depend on ψ, and therefore on all ψ_n, the system of coupled equations defined by (42) is non-linear and difficult to deal with exactly. For our purposes, however, it is sufficient to analyze the asymptotic behavior for $n \to \pm\infty$, which is feasible.

The range of n includes all integers, and therefore suitable fall-off conditions must be satisfied at both ends for a normalizable state in ℓ^2. However, it is sufficient to show that (42) has at least one normalizable solution for large positive and negative values of n, respectively, because one can always patch together a normalizable solution on $(-\infty, -1]$ with one on $(1, \infty]$ by choosing ψ_0 so that (42) holds for $n = 0$.

For the existence of normalizable solutions at large n, we consider the difference equation $\psi_{n+1} - 2\alpha\psi_n + \psi_{n-1} = 0$ with constant coefficients. Its solutions are $\psi^{\pm}_n = k^n_{\pm}$ with $k_{\pm} = \alpha \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 1}$. Solutions $\psi_{\pm}$ are normalizable if $|k_{\pm}| < 1$. These two numbers satisfy the relation $k_+ k_- = 1$, and therefore there can be at most one normalizable solution. There is no normalizable solution if and only if both $k_{\pm}$ lie on the unit circle, in which case $k_+ = k^*_-$. The latter condition can be fulfilled only if α is real with $|\alpha| \leq 1$. In all other cases, a normalizable solution exists and we are guaranteed to have a state saturating the uncertainty relation. Here, (43) is not real unless $J_- = 0$, which is generic enough to conclude the existence of coherent states. Solving effective equations for moments produces their quantum parameters, even if an explicit wave function is unknown. In the present example, we can use these results to extend [19], where wave functions for $\mathrm{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$-coherent states were obtained for small correlations. The moments of group coherent states found here then allow us to address cosmic forgetfulness, for which potentially large correlations and squeezing are important [11].

4.2 Moments of dynamical coherent states

For simple Hamiltonian operators, one can find dynamical coherent states that saturate the uncertainty relation at all times. Harmonic loop quantum cosmology [10], based on the non-canonical algebra (24) with the Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hat{J}_-$, provides such an example. Exact solutions for expectation values and moments in arbitrary states can first be found, and then restricted to those that saturate the uncertainty relation. The dynamical equations are slightly more compact if we use complex variables (V, J, J^*) and the corresponding moments.

Evolution in some time parameter λ is generated by $\hat{H}$. As per Ehrenfest's equations, expectation values obey

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} V = \frac{1}{i\hbar}\langle[\hat{V}, \hat{H}]\rangle = -\frac{1}{2}(J + J^*) \tag{44}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} J = \frac{1}{i\hbar}\langle[\hat{J}, \hat{H}]\rangle = -(V + \hbar/2) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} J^* \,, \tag{45}$$

solved by

$$V(\lambda) + \hbar/2 = A\cosh(\lambda - \lambda_0) \quad , \quad J(\lambda) = -A\sinh(\lambda - \lambda_0) + iH \tag{46}$$

since $\mathrm{Im}J = J_- = \langle\hat{H}\rangle =: H$, and with integration constants A and λ_0. Second-order moments satisfy the equations of motion [11]

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}(\Delta V)^2 &= -\Delta(VJ) - \Delta(VJ^*) && (47)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}(\Delta J)^2 &= -2\Delta(VJ) \quad , \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}(\Delta J^*)^2 = -2\Delta(VJ^*) && (48)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\Delta(VJ) &= -\frac{1}{2}(\Delta J)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Delta(JJ^*) - (\Delta V)^2 && (49)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\Delta(VJ^*) &= -\frac{1}{2}(\Delta J^*)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Delta(JJ^*) - (\Delta V)^2 && (50)\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\Delta(JJ^*) &= -\Delta(VJ) - \Delta(VJ^*) && (51)
\end{aligned}$$

solved by

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Delta V)^2(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{2}(c_3e^{-2\lambda} + c_4e^{2\lambda}) - \frac{1}{4}(c_1 + c_2)\\
(\Delta J)^2(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{2}(c_3e^{-2\lambda} + c_4e^{2\lambda}) + \frac{1}{4}(3c_2 - c_1) - i(c_5e^{\lambda} - c_6e^{-\lambda})\\
(\Delta J^*)^2(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{2}(c_3e^{-2\lambda} + c_4e^{2\lambda}) + \frac{1}{4}(3c_2 - c_1) + i(c_5e^{\lambda} - c_6e^{-\lambda})\\
\Delta(VJ)(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{2}(c_3e^{-2\lambda} - c_4e^{2\lambda}) + \frac{i}{2}(c_5e^{\lambda} + c_6e^{-\lambda})\\
\Delta(VJ^*)(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{2}(c_3e^{-2\lambda} - c_4e^{2\lambda}) - \frac{i}{2}(c_5e^{\lambda} + c_6e^{-\lambda})\\
\Delta(JJ^*)(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{2}(c_3e^{-2\lambda} + c_4e^{2\lambda}) + \frac{1}{4}(3c_1 - c_2)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

These equations and some of the following derivations can be found in [11, 20]. We list them here because we will be able to generalize them in the next subsection, for which we have to refer to the older results.

Here, $c_1 = -(\Delta V)^2 + \Delta(JJ^*)$ which by the reality condition (25) equals

$$c_1 = A^2 - H^2 \tag{52}$$

in terms of $H = \langle\hat{H}\rangle$ and the integration constant A in the solutions $V(\lambda)$ and $J(\lambda)$ in (46). Using $\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2}i(\hat{J} - \hat{J}^\dagger)$ we obtain

$$(\Delta H)^2 = -\frac{1}{4}\left((\Delta J)^2 - 2\Delta(JJ^*) + (\Delta J^*)^2\right) = \frac{1}{2}(c_1 - c_2)\,. \tag{53}$$

The remaining constants are subject to further conditions from reality and uncertainty bounds. From (38), requiring saturation,

$$4c_3c_4 = H^2\hbar^2 + \frac{1}{4}(c_1+c_2)^2\,. \tag{54}$$

Additional conditions follow from the other uncertainty relations, but they are equivalent once reality conditions are imposed.

The second-order reality conditions (36) and (37), evaluated for the explicit solutions, are λ-dependent. Comparing coefficients of different powers of e^λ, we obtain three independent equations

$$c_5 = \frac{A}{2H}\left(2c_4 - \tfrac{1}{2}(c_1+c_2)\right) \quad , \quad c_6 = \frac{A}{2H}\left(2c_3 - \tfrac{1}{2}(c_1+c_2)\right) \tag{55}$$

$$c_5 + c_6 = \frac{H}{A}(c_1-c_2)\,. \tag{56}$$

We use (56) to eliminate c_5 and c_6 from the sum of the two equations in (55),

$$c_3+c_4 = \frac{H}{A}(c_5+c_6) + \frac{1}{2}(c_1+c_2) = \frac{H^2}{A^2}(c_1-c_2) + \frac{1}{2}(c_1+c_2)\,, \tag{57}$$

and relate the remaining constants on the right-hand side to state parameters via

$$c_1-c_2 = 2(\Delta H)^2 \quad , \quad c_1+c_2 = 2c_1 - (c_1-c_2) = 2(A^2 - H^2 - (\Delta H)^2) \tag{58}$$

using (53) and (52).

Of particular interest is the asymmetry of volume fluctuations at $\lambda\to\infty$ compared with $\lambda\to-\infty$. In the cosmological model based on the present example, this asymmetry corresponds to the relation between fluctuations long before and long after the "bounce" when $V(\lambda)$ in (46) is minimal at $\lambda=\lambda_0$. It is given by the absolute value of the difference of c_3 and c_4, which we can obtain from the sum (57) using (54):

$$\begin{aligned}(c_3-c_4)^2 = (c_3+c_4)^2 - 4c_3c_4 &= \frac{H^4}{A^4}(c_1-c_2)^2 + \frac{H^2}{A^2}(c_1^2-c_2^2) - H^2\hbar^2 \\ &= 4H^2\left(\left(1-\frac{H^2}{A^2}\right)(\Delta H)^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{4} + \left(\frac{H^2}{A^2}-1\right)\frac{(\Delta H)^4}{A^2}\right)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

The solutions of this subsection tell us how moments evolve, starting from some initial values that belong to an initial state. If the initial state saturates the uncertainty relation, it will always do so: the left-hand side of the relation is a Casimir function on the space of moments. If we combine our solutions with the results of the previous subsection, we are guaranteed the existence of dynamical coherent states, for we know that there is a coherent initial state whose moments must evolve as derived here. The question, addressed in [5, 20], is then in how far the coherence of the state can restrict the asymmetry of fluctuations.

4.3 Beyond coherent states, and cosmic forgetfulness

At this stage, we have reproduced the asymmetry derived in [20] from all three uncertainty relations in a different way, using reality conditions and only one of the uncertainty relations. Since we already know that second-order reality conditions reduce the number of uncertainty relations to just one, this result is not surprising. However, the rederivation allows a powerful generalization of the asymmetry formula to all semiclassical states, not just dynamically coherent ones. Our reality conditions are valid provided only that moments of order higher than second are subdominant, which is the most general definition of semiclassical states. The preceding derivation remains intact if we change the equality in (54) to an inequality once we depart from dynamical coherent states. In this way, the last formula, (59), changes to the inequality

$$(c_3 - c_4)^2 \leq 4H^2 \left(\left(1 - \frac{H^2}{A^2}\right) (\Delta H)^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{4} + \left(\frac{H^2}{A^2} - 1\right) \frac{(\Delta H)^4}{A^2} \right) \tag{60}$$

valid for all semiclassical states (or, more generally, whenever moments of order three and higher can be ignored, even if second-order moments are large compared to expectation values). In particular, the change of volume fluctuations is bounded by the quantum fluctuation ΔH of the Hamiltonian. (In the cosmological model, H corresponds to the momentum of a free, massless scalar used to parameterize time.) The inequality derived here generalizes the identity found in [11] for dynamical coherent states saturating the uncertainty relation. It is also consistent with the bound derived in [21] for a larger class of states.

The question of asymmetric volume fluctuations has been raised in [5] and led to a lively debate in the literature on loop quantum cosmology. Even though the asymmetry of volume fluctuations is bounded by energy fluctuations, ensuring that an initial semiclassical state does not develop too-large volume fluctuations, the change of fluctuations may nevertheless be significant. Moreover, it depends sensitively on the initial values [20]. If the moments of a state had to be known for long-term state evolution, the sensitivity and potential significant changes near the turning point of $\langle \hat{V} \rangle$ render a reliable analysis of the state at very early times practically impossible, implying cosmic forgetfulness. (As noted, the issue is not as relevant in recent versions of the scenario, in which one is required to eliminate deterministic evolution through the "bounce" due to signature change at high density.)

The possibility of significant changes in volume fluctuations becomes clear when one looks at the relative change of relative volume fluctuations, for dynamical coherent states given by

$$\left| 1 - \frac{\lim_{\lambda\to-\infty}(\Delta V)^2(\lambda)}{\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}(\Delta V)^2(\lambda)} \right| = \frac{|c_3 - c_4|}{c_4} \sim \frac{(\Delta H)^2}{(\Delta V)^2}\,. \tag{61}$$

If this value is near zero, volume fluctuations are nearly symmetric. However, the ratio on the right-hand side depends more sensitively on the precise state and cannot be restricted to be small without further assumptions. Moreover, in cosmology it is usually a safe assumption that matter behaves more quantum than geometry; thus, the energy fluctuation should be expected to be significantly larger than volume fluctuations and the right-hand

side is much larger than one. Large changes of volume fluctuations are not ruled out, implying, together with the large sensitivity to initial values, that the early state cannot be reconstructed precisely even if evolution were deterministic.

5 Conclusions

We have presented several constructions and results for moments of states in quantum systems corresponding to irreducible representations of groups. The Casimir conditions that select a representation can be dealt with using methods for effective first-class constrained systems. In contrast to the general case of first-class constraints, simplifications occur that allowed us to draw conclusions for arbitrary orders in a semiclassical or moment expansion. Our effective methods are then particularly useful to derive representation-independent relationships between moments of group coherent states. Some of our results on uncertainty relations can be applied more generally, even when no Casimir condition is imposed.

These methods are useful whenever it is difficult to construct explicit wave functions for group (or other) coherent states. We have shown this in our cosmological example, in which the question of cosmic forgetfulness requires good control on all possible coherent states, not just on those of small squeezing which are easier to construct as wave functions. When no assumption on the amount of squeezing is made, even a coherent state does not allow good control on quantum parameters such as fluctuations compared over long time intervals.

As also shown in this example, it is possible to show that coherent states exist even without knowing their wave functions. Effective equations for moments then allow one to compute the corresponding quantum parameters. Results obtained by these effective methods are no less reliable than those of more cumbersome calculations using explicit wave functions.

Acknowledgements

We thank David Brizuela for discussions. This work was supported in part by NSF grants PHY-0748336 and PHY-1307408.

A Ordering relations

Some of the equations in this paper can be reproduced by making use of the following relationships:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{C} &= (\hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{C})_{\rm Weyl} - \frac{1}{4}\Big(\{\hat{A},[\hat{C},\hat{B}]\}+\{\hat{B},[\hat{C},\hat{A}]\}+\{\hat{C},[\hat{B},\hat{A}]\}\Big) \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{6}\Big([\hat{B},[\hat{C},\hat{A}]]-2[\hat{A},[\hat{C},\hat{B}]]\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{C}\hat{D} &= (\hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{C}\hat{D})_{\rm Weyl} \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2}\Big((\hat{C}\hat{D}[\hat{B},\hat{A}])_{\rm Weyl}+(\hat{B}\hat{D}[\hat{C},\hat{A}])_{\rm Weyl}+(\hat{B}\hat{C}[\hat{D},\hat{A}])_{\rm Weyl} \\ &\quad +(\hat{A}\hat{C}[\hat{D},\hat{B}])_{\rm Weyl}+(\hat{A}\hat{D}[\hat{C},\hat{B}])_{\rm Weyl}+(\hat{A}\hat{B}[\hat{D},\hat{C}])_{\rm Weyl}\Big) \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{8}\Big(\{[\hat{A},\hat{B}],[\hat{C},\hat{D}]\}+\{[\hat{A},\hat{C}],[\hat{B},\hat{D}]\}+\{[\hat{A},\hat{D}],[\hat{B},\hat{C}]\}\Big) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{12}\Big(2\{\hat{C},[[\hat{B},\hat{A}],\hat{D}]\}-\{\hat{C},[[\hat{D},\hat{A}],\hat{B}]\}+2\{\hat{D},[[\hat{B},\hat{A}],\hat{C}]\}-\{\hat{D},[[\hat{C},\hat{A}],\hat{B}]\} \\ &\quad +2\{\hat{B},[[\hat{C},\hat{A}],\hat{D}]\}-\{\hat{B},[[\hat{D},\hat{A}],\hat{C}]\}+2\{\hat{A},[[\hat{C},\hat{B}],\hat{D}]\}-\{\hat{A},[[\hat{D},\hat{B}],\hat{C}]\}\Big) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{12}\Big([\hat{D},[[\hat{C},\hat{B}],\hat{A}]]+[\hat{C},[[\hat{D},\hat{B}],\hat{A}]]+[\hat{B},[[\hat{D},\hat{C}],\hat{A}]]-2[\hat{A},[[\hat{D},\hat{C}],\hat{B}]]\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

using (only here) anticommutators $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ to denote symmetrization. Practically, these relations can be derived somewhat systematically by starting with the totally symmetrically ordered $(\hat{A}\hat{B}\cdots)_{\rm Weyl}$ and applying suitable commutators to arrive at the ordering $\hat{A}\hat{B}\cdots$, upon which lower-order relations can be used to symmetrize all remaining terms. (Note that we write expressions such as $(\hat{C}\hat{D}[\hat{B},\hat{A}])_{\rm Weyl}$ with the understanding that the commutator $[\hat{B},\hat{A}]$ has been evaluated before symmetrization is applied.)

The structure of these relations, with terms making use of different compositions of symmetrization and antisymmetrization, follows more easily from Young tableaux. However, the standard Young projectors write antisymmetrizations by summing over permutation groups, rather than by iterated applications of commutators. This latter form is more useful for our purposes and would have to be derived from full antisymmetrizations if Young tableaux were used.

References

[1] M. Bojowald and A. Skirzewski, Effective Equations of Motion for Quantum Systems, *Rev. Math. Phys.* 18 (2006) 713–745, [math-ph/0511043]

[2] M. Bojowald and A. Skirzewski, Quantum Gravity and Higher Curvature Actions, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* 4 (2007) 25–52, [hep-th/0606232]

[3] M. Bojowald, B. Sandhöfer, A. Skirzewski, and A. Tsobanjan, Effective constraints for quantum systems, *Rev. Math. Phys.* 21 (2009) 111–154, [arXiv:0804.3365]

[4] M. Bojowald and A. Tsobanjan, Effective constraints for relativistic quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. D* 80 (2009) 125008, [arXiv:0906.1772]

[5] M. Bojowald, What happened before the big bang?, *Nature Physics* 3 (2007) 523–525

[6] M. Bojowald, Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Living Rev. Relativity* 11 (2008) 4, [gr-qc/0601085], `http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2008-4`

[7] M. Bojowald and G. M. Paily, Deformed General Relativity and Effective Actions from Loop Quantum Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* 86 (2012) 104018, [arXiv:1112.1899]

[8] T. Cailleteau, J. Mielczarek, A. Barrau, and J. Grain, Anomaly-free scalar perturbations with holonomy corrections in loop quantum cosmology, *Class. Quant. Grav.* 29 (2012) 095010, [arXiv:1111.3535]

[9] M. Bojowald and T. Strobl, Poisson Geometry in Constrained Systems, *Rev. Math. Phys.* 15 (2003) 663–703, [hep-th/0112074]

[10] M. Bojowald, Large scale effective theory for cosmological bounces, *Phys. Rev. D* 75 (2007) 081301(R), [gr-qc/0608100]

[11] M. Bojowald, Dynamical coherent states and physical solutions of quantum cosmological bounces, *Phys. Rev. D* 75 (2007) 123512, [gr-qc/0703144]

[12] M. Bojowald and A. Tsobanjan, Effective constraints and physical coherent states in quantum cosmology: A numerical comparison, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 27 (2010) 145004, [arXiv:0911.4950]

[13] M. Bojowald, P. A. Höhn, and A. Tsobanjan, An effective approach to the problem of time, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 28 (2011) 035006, [arXiv:1009.5953]

[14] M. Bojowald, P. A. Höhn, and A. Tsobanjan, An effective approach to the problem of time: general features and examples, *Phys. Rev. D* 83 (2011) 125023, [arXiv:1011.3040]

[15] P. A. Höhn, E. Kubalova, and A. Tsobanjan, Effective relational dynamics of a nonintegrable cosmological model, *Phys. Rev. D* 86 (2012) 065014, [arXiv:1111.5193]

[16] A. Tsobanjan, in preparation

[17] D. Brizuela, A formalism based on statistical moments for classical and quantum dynamics: application to cosmology, to appear

[18] M. Bojowald, D. Mulryne, W. Nelson, and R. Tavakol, The high-density regime of kinetic-dominated loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* 82 (2010) 124055, [arXiv:1004.3979]

[19] E. R. Livine and M. Martín-Benito, Group theoretical Quantization of Isotropic Loop Cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* 85 (2012) 124052, [arXiv:1204.0539]

[20] M. Bojowald, Harmonic cosmology: How much can we know about a universe before the big bang?, *Proc. Roy. Soc. A* 464 (2008) 2135–2150, [arXiv:0710.4919]

[21] W. Kaminski and T. Pawlowski, Cosmic recall and the scattering picture of Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* 81 (2010) 084027, [arXiv:1001.2663]